PR4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,531	02/15/2000	Ilan Caron	1018.070US1	8026

23460 7590 08/25/2003

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER	
CAO, DIEM K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	12

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/504,531	CARON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K Cao	2126	

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 July 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *11-57* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *11-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 7/1/2003.

2. Claims 11-57 remain in the application. Applicant has amended claims 11-12, 14-17, 20, 27-28, 30-32, 36, 40-41 and 43-45, cancelled claims 1-10, and added claims 48-57.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 11-24, 26-37, 39-51, and 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piskiel et al. (U.S. 5,893,911) in view of Cohen (U.S. 5,881,315).

As to claim 11, Piskiel teaches receiving a message in a queue (a publishing application ... queue 212; col. 7, lines 45-64), wherein the queue is associated with at least one rule (rules based message distribution 204, rule bases, subscription rules; col. 7, line 45 - col. 8, line 67) and each rule comprises a condition (rule clause; col. 8, line 51 - col. 9, line 34) and an action (a single published message instance ... perform a specific action; col. 9, lines 35-46), checking whether the condition of the at least one rule of the trigger associated with the queue is satisfied by the message (when the identified ... evaluate to TRUE; col. 9, lines 1-34), and upon determining that the condition of the rule is satisfied by the message, performing the action of the rule (the particular action ... to be performed; col. 9, l-34).

However, Piskiel does not explcitly teach the queue is associated with at least one trigger.

Cohen teaches the queue is associated with at least one trigger (event filter group; col. 6, line 59 - col. 7, line 12).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Cohen to the system of Piskiel because it provides the users with method to locate and register with one or more event management services to control the type of events to receive.

As to claim 12, Piskiel teaches performing the action of the rule comprises activating each of at least one module referenced by the rule (a single published message ... performed; col. 9, lines 35-67).

As to claim 13, Piskiel teaches there are many type of actions in the system such as initiating execution of a new application, terminating execution of an application, sending message to the registered consumers (col. 9, line 62 - col. 10, line15) and the action table identified the specific information related to the action to be performed (col. 13, lines 36-56). However, Piskiel does not teach each module comprises one of a software components and an executable program file. It would have been obvious to modify the system of Piskiel to include software components and executable program files to carry out the task because it provides the users/developers with an effective method to maintain the system when modify the action.

As to claim 14, Piskiel teaches activating each of at least one module referenced by the rule comprises passing the message to the module (send a transaction message to a subscribing process/application program; col. 9, lines 35-65).

As to claim 15, Piskiel does not explicitly teach each trigger has an enabled state and a disabled state, checking for the message received in the queue only when the trigger is in the enabled state. Cohen teaches user can create and modify trigger (col. 8, line 1-10). It would have

been obvious the user could also disable the trigger and not to receive any more messages/event type, thus the message would not be checked when the trigger is disable. It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Cohen to the system of Piskiel because it would provide a method to the user to create and/or modify the trigger.

As to claim 16, Piskiel teaches the at least one rule comprises a short-circuit rule, such that satisfaction by the message received in the queue of the condition of the rule causes checking for satisfaction of the condition of any non-checked rules of the at least one rule to stop (the rule clause is ignored for ... table entry; col. 8, lines 51-67).

As to claim 17, Piskiel does not teach the at least one rule comprises a destructive rule, such that satisfaction by the message received in the queue of the condition of the rule removes the message from the queue. Cohen teaches a destructive rule, such that satisfaction by the message of the condition of the rule removes the message from the queue (when that count reaches zero ... deleted from the active queue; col. 9, line 47 – col. 10, line 27).

As to claim 18, Piskiel teaches checking is performed in a serial manner (Element 800 is first ... published message; col. 16, lines 27 - 67).

As to claim 19, Piskiel does not teach checking is performed in a concurrent manner. Piskiel teaches checking is performed in a serial manner (Element 800 is first ... published message; col. 16, lines 27 - 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Piskiel to have the checking performed in the serial manner.

As to claims 20 and 36, see rejection of claims 11 and 15 above. Cohen further teaches (col. 5, line 50- col. 6, line 24) a trigger store (Event Filter Database 46), a trigger service (Event Management Service).

As to claim 21, Cohen teaches the trigger store corresponds to a particular computer and references each of the at least one trigger within a trigger database (Event Filter Database 46; col. 5, line 50 - col. 6, line 24).

As to claim 22, Piskiel teaches the queue comprises data stored on a computer-readable medium (queue 212; col. 7, line 45 - col. 10, line 54).

As to claim 23, Cohen teaches the trigger store comprises data stored on a computer-readable medium (Event Filter Database 46; col. 5, line 50 - col. 6, line 58).

As to claim 24, Cohen teaches the trigger service comprises a computer program executed by a processor from a computer-readable medium (EMS; col. 5, line 50 - col. 6, line 58).

As to claim 26, see rejection of claim 2 above.

As to claim 27, Piskiel teaches (col. 9, lines 1-67) the trigger service is designed to perform the action associated with a rule by activating each of the module referenced the rule (The action table ... file or database).

As to claim 28, see rejection of claims 13 and 27 above.

As to claim 29, see rejection of claim 13 above.

As to claim 30, see rejections of claims 14 and 27 above.

As to claims 31-34, see rejections of claims 16-19 above.

As to claim 35, Piskiel teaches the system comprises at least one computer (system #1, system #2; col. 5, line 61 - col. 6, line 17).

As to claim 37, see rejection of claim 21 above.

As to claim 39, Piskiel does not teach the trigger store of the at least one trigger

comprises a trigger store of a plurality of ordered triggers. Cohen teaches the trigger store of a plurality of triggers (multiple consumer, each consumer associated with an event filter group; col. 8, lines 1-44) and the triggers are checked in order (EMS goes on to the next consumer; col. 7, lines 27-55).

As to claims 40-47, see rejections of claims 27-34 above.

As to claim 48, see rejection of claim 11 above. Piskiel further teaches receiving as part of a transaction a message in a queue (transaction processing application; col 6, line 29-46 and published message ... queue; col. 7, lines 45-64).

As to claims 49-51 and 53, see rejections of claims 12-14 and 16.

As to claim 56, Piskiel teaches the at least one rule comprises a set of rules (rule, rule clauses; col. 8, lines 51-67), and the rules are check in sequence (For each published message ...desired action performed; col 10, lines 17-44), and only the messages that have msg_id filed are to be checked by the rest of the clause (the rule_id column ... table entry; col. 8, lines 51-67). Although Piskiel does not explicitly specified the ordered set of rules, Piskiel set of rules are ordered because only the messages that qualified rule (have msg_id field) will be checked.

As to claim 54, see rejection of claim 56 above.

As to claim 55, see rejection of claim 17 above.

As to claim 57, it is rejected under the same ground of claim 56.

5. Claims 25, 38 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piskiel et al. (U.S. 5,893,911) in view of Cohen (U.S. 5,881,315) further in view of Moore et al. (U.S. 5,630,127).

As to claims 25, 38 and 52, Piskiel does not explicitly teach a trigger manager designed

to provide for creating, editing and deleting triggers in a visual, non-programming manner. Cohen teaches the trigger is created and modified by the user using the Consumer API (col. 8, lines 1-10). Moore teaches (col. 5, line 31 - col. 11, line 43) a trigger manager (the GRMS 108) designed to provide for creating, editing and deleting triggers in a visual, non-programming manner. It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Moore to the system of Piskiel and Cohen because it would provide a method for a business professional, and not a software expert, can create and modified the triggers.

Response to Arguments

Claims 11, 20, 36 and 48

As to Applicant's arguments (page 10, line 13 - page 11, line 16) regarding the combination of Piskiel and Cohen does not teach all the limitations of the independent claims. Applicant further suggests that the event filter is called a condition. However, Cohen teaches (col. 6, line 59 - col. 7, line 12) a trigger (event filter group), each trigger comprises at least one rule (event filter), each rule comprises at least a condition (filter expression, compare operation) and action associated with the rule (pass the event to the RPC mechanism for delivery to the registered event consumer; col 7, lines 27-57). Also, the claims are rejected under the combination of Piskiel and Cohen, the as discuss above and in the independent claims, all the limitations are taught.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-6296 for regular communications and (703) 305-9731 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:
- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7238.
- OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7239.
- NON-OFFICIAL/DRAFT faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746-7140.

Diem Cao
August 22, 2003

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100